



REMARKS

A. Pending Claims

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application for reconsideration. The Examiner has rejected all pending claims in an Office Action mailed January 12, 2006. Favorable reconsideration of this application as presented herein is requested in light of Applicants' remarks below.

B. Office Action Mailed January 12, 2006

In the Office Action mailed January 12, 2006, the Examiner has rejected all four pending claims on various grounds. Applicants note that the Examiner has apparently not considered the claims as amended by Applicants with the amendment dated March 3, 2003. A copy of the March 3, 2003 Amendment is enclosed. As a result of the March 3, 2003, Amendment claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 are pending. Original claim 4 was canceled. Also enclosed is a copy of the postcard bearing the USPTO stamp acknowledging receipt of the Amendment. Applicant further notes that the claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 were previously allowed. Applicants enclose a copy of the prior Issue Fee and Notice of Allowance directed to claims 1, 2, 3 and 5.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-4 on nonstatutory-obvious-type double patenting over claims 1-10 of copending U.S. Application No. 11/249,976. In response, Applicants are prepared to submit a terminal disclaimer signed by Applicant's attorney of record and directed to claims 1, 2, 3 and 5. Secondly, the Examiner has rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,286 to Jahagirdar et al. ("Jahagirdar") in view of Japanese Patent No. 405014540A to Yoshida et al. ("Yoshida"), over Jahagirdar in view of Yoshida and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,077,832 to Szczutkowski et al ("Szczutkowski") or Jahagirdar in view of Yoshida and further in view of

U.S. Patent No. 6,035,180 to Kubes et al. ("Kubes"). In response, Applicants have discussed and distinguished, below, Jahagirdar and Yoshida as not disclosing alone or in combination the independently controlled first address data bus and second address data bus of the claims. Furthermore, Applicants distinguish Szczutkowski and Kubes as failing to disclose Applicants' claimed invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 are patentably distinct and allowable over the cited art.

C. Discussion of Cited Prior Art

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jahagirdar in view of Yoshida. In relying on Jahagirdar, the Examiner explains that line 524, as shown in Figure 5, is a first address bus. However, line 524 is not a data bus. Rather, line 524 is a connection that is identified as having the function of supplying electric power to driver 514 and display element 516. Thus, Jahagirdar fails to disclose a first data address bus and a second address data bus that are used for transferring data as recited in claim 1.

Next, Yoshida is relied upon as disclosing a second address data bus, namely, signal line 44. Signal line 44 is not a bus. In Yoshida, signals are transferred between the control section 38 and the display section 36, via the signal line 44 (not a bus) which is separately provided as is well known (Yoshida at [0035]). A signal line 44 is used, rather than a bus, because when digital signals are transferred using a high-speed bus, 42, the high speed bus causes enormous noise (Yoshida at [0012]). Additionally, in a case where the signal line 44 is not provided as in Fig. 2 of Yoshida, during a period of receiving slots, since the control section 38 performs a control so that the operation of the bus 42 is halted (Yoshida at [0032]), signals are not transferred from the control section to the display section. Accordingly, Yoshida does not disclose that signal line 44 is a bus and fails to suggest or teach a second address bus that is

independently controlled by a controller. Moreover, Yoshida discloses in the Abstract that "the number of wires for the control signal is reduced and small size and light weight are attained." Thus, Yoshida teaches away from multiple buses in an effort to reduce the number of wires and size of the device. Consequently, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Jahagirdar when considered alone or in combination with Yoshida.

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Jahagirdar in view of Yoshida and further in view of Szczutkowski.

In Szczutkowski, the data output line (DATA OUT) is not exclusively used for LCD display 122. The data output line DATA OUT is also used for communication between the microprocessor 152 and other elements such as the shift-register 170. An LCD exclusive address data bus as claimed is not shown in this reference. Further, the reference fails to teach or suggest that while the radio signal is received, access to the LCD exclusive address data bus is prohibited. Absent hindsight of Applicants' invention, there is no motivation or teaching to combine Jahagirdar and Yoshida with the Szczutkowski because the latter describes a radio transceiver and not a mobile telephone. Consequently, claim 2 is not rendered obvious by Jahagirdar alone or when considered in combination with Yoshida and/or Szczutkowski. Claim 4 was canceled in Applicants' March 3, 2003 Amendment. Claim 5 is also patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner also rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Jahagirdar in view of Yoshida and further in view of Kubes.

The Kubes Patent discloses a voltage applied to a conductive layer or conductive wire of the display which generates light. A voltage or current across the etched "wires" in layers 23 and 24 would cause light to be produced from the regions of the composite layers 25/26 of electroluminescent material. However, the reference fails to show a drive voltage for an

address data bus which is connected to the display means. In the present invention, the LCD exclusive address data bus is driven by lower voltage so that the noise from the LCD data bus is reduced.

Moreover, absent hindsight of Applicants' invention, there is no motivation or teaching to combine the Jahagirdar Patent with the Kubes Patent because the purpose of the Kubes Patent is to provide pixels that are controlled to both create a decorative design on the housing of the telephone and to generate a user input-output region and a display region. This is quite different than the present invention which teaches that by using the LCD exclusive address data bus 11 for the LCD controller 7 independently of other blocks, the noise from the address data bus 10 generated when blocks other than the LCD controller 7 are accessed is minimized.

Consequently, claim 3 is not rendered obvious by Jahagirdar alone or when considered in combination with Yoshida and/or Kubes.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that this patent application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is urged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel at the number provided below if it will advance the prosecution of this application. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
212-756-2000

Dated: April 12, 2006
New York, New York

By: Anna Vishev
Anna Vishev
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,018

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Date of Deposit: April 12, 2006

I hereby certify under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 that this correspondence and enumerated documents are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Name: Sarah Schlie

Signature:

Sarah Schlie
Schulte Roth & Zabel, LLP
